DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 778 CS 209 932

AUTHOR Jolliffe, Lee
TITLE Gender Differentiation in the New York "Times": 1885 and 1985.
PUB DATE Aug 86
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (69th, Norman, OK, August 3-6, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Content Analysis; Females; Males; *Media Research; *Newspapers; Press Opinion; *Sex Bias; Sex Differences; *Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; Social Change
IDENTIFIERS Journalism History; *New York Times

ABSTRACT

A study examined the descriptive language and sex-linked roles ascribed to women and men in articles of the New York "Times" from 1885 and 1985. Seven content analysis methods were applied to four random samples from the "Times"; one sample each for women and men from both years. Samples were drawn using randomly constructed months, with one day of the week from each quarter year. Methods of analysis included space alloted, topical categorization of stories, occupational roles portrayed, and language choices made. The results indicated that after 100 years, women are portrayed somewhat less in terms of sex-role identifier; however, identification of women by their familial roles remains frequent. Men are portrayed in economic roles, and participation in family activities is nearly ignored. In 1985, stories about men were most likely to portray them as objects of another's actions or victims of violence. Appendices contain tables showing role categorizations, proper name usage, placement in active/passive headlines, and other measures. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED271778

Gender Differentiation in the New York Times: 1885 and 1985

by Lee Jolliffe
Doctoral Candidate
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lee Jolliffe
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Mailing Address:

458 Vermont Place
Columbus, Ohio 43201
(614) 294-6190 //
(614) 424-5989

Note: This paper was formerly titled "Effectiveness of Six Content Analysis Methods for Measuring Gender Differentiation." A change of emphasis was recommended by reviewers and is reflected in the new title and revised content.

CS 209 932

© Jolliffe 1986

Gender Differentiation in the New York Times: 1885 and 1985

by Lee Jolliffe
Doctoral Candidate
Ohio University

Issues of the New York Times dated 1885 and 1985 are sampled to determine whether and how much women and men have been freed from sex-role stereotypes. Several methods of content analysis are used to examine prominence or location of the articles in the newspaper: space allotted; topical categorization of stories; occupational roles portrayed; language choices made; use of factual, inferential, or judgmental references; and use of active or passive sentence constructions in headlines. Results indicated that after 100 years, women are portrayed somewhat less in terms of sex-role identifier; however, identification of women by their familial roles remains frequent. Men are portrayed in economic roles, and participation in family activities is nearly ignored. In 1985, stories about men were most likely to portray them as objects of another's actions or victims of violence.

Gender Differentiation in the New York Times: 1885 and 1985

This article examines the descriptive language and sex-linked roles ascribed to women and men in articles of the New York Times dated 1985 from the perspective of similar coverage in 1885. A sample of stories about women and men from both years is subjected to several methods of content analysis to discover: prominence or location in the newspaper; space allotted; topical categorization of stories; occupational roles portrayed; language choices made; use of factual, inferential or judgmental references; and placement in active/passive sentence constructions in headlines.

Results from each of these methods will be described and compared to characterize the changes in gender differentiation over the last 100 years.

Typically, media gender studies have used two to four content analysis methods in tandem. In studies cited for this research, for example, Davis[1] used measures of location, space, identifying language, and headline size. Miller[2] examined numbers of photos, roles portrayed, and location. Geunin[3] used measures of space allotted and topical categorization, while Blackwood[4] used measures of space, roles, and location drawn in part from Miller's study. Jolliffe and Bond[5] used measures of factual, inferential, and judgmental reporting, as well as identifying language. Barcus conducted the most thorough study, using 29 measures in an examination of sex roles on children's television.[6] Placement of the protagonist in an

active or a passive sentence structure in the headline has not previously been used as a measure in media gender studies, but may be a clear and easily coded means of testing for sex differentiation; results from this method will be compared here with the more common ones.

The purpose of this investigation is to discover whether and how much women and men have been freed from sex-role stereotypes in one prestigious newspaper's portrayals from the nineteenth century to the twentieth.

METHOD

Sampling. The seven content analysis methods were applied to 4 random samples from the New York Times; 1 sample each for women and men in 1885 and 1985. Samples were drawn using randomly constructed months[7], with one day of the week from each quarter of the year. The use of the 1885 newspapers necessitated unusual criteria for story selection, because the separation of hard news from editorial, social, and business news was not yet conventional. Typically, women appeared as protagonists in stories that were a mixture of hard news and human interest. Therefore, for all samples, stories that centered on women or men in hard news or human interest were selected for study.

The stories about women in selected issues from 1885 were narrowed to 45[8] by discarding every 4th story; another 31 were discarded at random. In 1885, the New York Times averaged 8 pages about 15 by 25 1/2 inches; the 1985 New York Times was considerably longer. To simplify sampling, the first story with a woman and the first story with a man as the protagonist were selected. The

sampled issues of the 1885 Times posed no problem in finding a woman's story in each issue; however, the corresponding 1985 Times issue frequently did not have any story about a woman in the selected issue. In the 9 issues where this occurred, subsequent issues were searched until a story with a woman protagonist was found. Thus, samples for each gender for each year numbered 45.

Prominence or Location in the Medium. Miller[9] classified prominence in modern newspaper sections by coding appearances as Page 1, Inside, Business, Lifestyle, Entertainment, and Sports. These classifications were used on the 1985 sample. For the 1985 samples, since only the first story about a woman or man was included, conclusions cannot be drawn about where such stories typically fall, but only about where the first of them might be expected to be located. The 1885 sample could not be compared for this variable because the size and format of the paper was quite different.

Space Allotted. Guenin[10] and Davis[11] are two of the many researchers who have used space measures. In this study, Davis' technique was used. The varying column widths and story lengths were measured to the nearest one-eighth inch and the resulting numbers converted to square inches for comparison.

Topical Categorization. Ryan and Owen[12], Barcus[13], and others have used topical categorizations to examine gender differentiation in media. The Barcus subject area categories are well-designed, but geared toward children's television. A similarly complete categorization geared toward newspapers was developed by Stempel from Deutschmann's News-page Content of Twelve Metropolitan Dailies.[14] The Stempel categories were used here; they are 1) politics and

government acts, 2) war and defense, 3) diplomacy and foreign relations, 4) economic activity, 5) agriculture, 6) transportation and travel, 7) crime, 8) pubic moral problems, 9) accidents and disasters, 10) science and invention, 11) public health and welfare, 12) education, classic arts, and religion, 13) popular amusements, and 14) general human interest. More complete definitions of these categories are provided in the Appendix.

Occupational Roles. The chief occupational role of the protagonist of each story was categorized using Miller's[15] excellent definitions of roles. Miller's definitions are concerned not with the ordinary role of a protagonist (such as teacher or lawyer), but ask what role a person has played that resulted in this appearance in the newspaper. For example, the role "criminal" is defined as "portrayed as arrested for, charged with or convicted of breaking the law. Includes persons in custody; on trial. Does not include witnesses or persons not formally charged with a crime." (See the Appendix for complete definitions of roles by Miller.) Roles include politician/public official; professional; sports figure; entertainer; socialite/celebrity; activist/advocate; criminal; human interest; spouse; and other. (Many other examinations have been made of women's roles in media[16].)

Signifier Counts. Many linguists[17] have examined "signifiers" of women and men in text to discern gender differentiation; Jolliffe and Bond[18] examined use of such signifiers in newspapers. For this study, all nouns and adjectives referring to the protagonists of the stories were collected, collated, and examined. The use of a style-

book in 1985 was taken into consideration.

Factual, Inferential, and Judgmental References. Ryan, Jolliffe and Bond, and others have used S.I. Hayakawa's reports, inferences, and judgments classifications of communication[19] to examine newspaper coverage of social issues. Here, the signifier words were rated by two coders using Hayakawa's categories and gender differences compared.

Placement in Active/Passive Sentence Constructions. Holsti[20] writes that the sentence is rarely used as a unit of analysis because of the difficulty of categorizing a single sentence's content. Headlines have been analyzed, though, by means of space measurement (Davis[21]) and type (Windhauser and Stempel[22]).

For purposes of gender differentiation, a new method of headline analysis is introduced here. Headlines were coded as "woman acts," "woman is acted upon," "woman is," "man acts," "man is acted upon," "man is," and "other." Categories "woman/man is acted upon" were coded any time a protagonist appeared in the headline as a direct object or object of a preposition. Where headlines did not present a codable structure, "other" was coded. This method offers a clear picture of how women and men are perceived by reporters and editors: as active entities or passive ones; and there is little room for interpretation or bias introduced by encoders.

RESULTS

General. The issues of 1885 were not altogether unlike those of 1985 in the New York Times. Crime, unemployment, public health, poverty, and the need for world peace were recurring themes in both sample sets. While the Times of 1885 tended to

themes in both sample sets. While the Times of 1885 tended to describe these in many small stories about individuals caught up in events, the Times of 1985 reports on issues, generally referring to many individuals in a single story. Stories that focus on individuals in the 1985 Times generally focus on men; as mentioned earlier, nine of the 30 issues selected initially as a sample set contained no stories at all about women, and subsequent issues were drawn upon to complete the sample set.

Prominence. Men are given considerably more prominence in the 1985 Times than women. Twenty percent of the 1985 issues randomly selected contained no stories about women. Obtaining the requisite number of stories about women (45, to match the 1885 sample used) was obtained only after reading the next day's paper in 9 cases. An equal number of stories with one male or one female protagonist appeared on the front pages of the Times (4); and most stories about either sex appeared on inside pages of the newspaper (30, women; 39, men). (Results are displayed in Tables 1 through 9 in the Appendix; see Table 1.)

The 1885 samples were not considered in terms of prominence. The paper was only 8 pages on the average. The correlation between the pages of Times of 1885 and 1985, should there be one, is likely to be logarithmic rather than linear and thus, without readership studies, impossible to calculate with surety.

Space Allotted. Space measured 581.35 for women in 1885 (45 stories), 1049 for women in 1985 (36 stories, 9 issues containing no story), and 1146.49 for men in 1985 (45 stories). Article size for women approximately doubled, but article size in general also increased. It appears that when women received coverage in 1985,

the length of the article met or exceeded that of articles about men. Because 9 sampled issues contained no stories about women, however, one would have to conclude that space allotted to women is not yet equal to space allotted to men.

Topical Categorization. The Stempel general news categories were labelled "T" (traditional) and "N" (nontraditional) for societal sex roles "M" (male) and "F" (female). Categories labelled TM/NF were politics and government acts, war and defense, diplomacy and foreign relations, economic activity, agriculture, transportation and travel, crime, and science and invention. In 1885, 11% of stories about women fell into nontraditional categories; in 1985, 41% of the stories were in nontraditional realms. (See Table 2.)

Changes in male sex-role expectations are more difficult to show, since few areas of public interest were ever closed to men. Categories that were labelled NM/TF included only public moral problems and general human interest (where lifestyle-page articles fall). Even these categories included male protagonists in the past; 11% of 1885 articles about men fell into these categories, while 16% of 1985 articles were in these categories. No articles about men in the classic arts, education, or religion appeared in the 1885 sample; this category contained 20% of the articles about men in 1985. Current events have to some extent biased this finding, however. The advent of "liberation theology" accounts for all but two of the nine articles.

Roles Portrayed. Examination of roles portrayed by the protagonists of news stories also shows great changes for women without

showing equivalent changes for men. Of the 10 roles in Miller's article, all are traditionally male except "spouse" and "other (or prop)." Three were accepted female roles in 1885 (including "spouse," "activist" (e.g., social reformer), and "human interest"), while five are "traditionally female" (e.g., pre-Friedan) roles today (including "spouse," "other [prop]," "entertainer," "socialite/celebrity," and "human interest," the last three also traditionally male). Examination of roles portrayed provides more information, however, than does the simpler topical categorization. A woman may appear (as several did) as the victim in a crime story; topical categorization would include this under "crime," whereas Miller's roles would not include this under "criminal." (See Table 3.)

In 1885, women appeared in 26% of the articles in nontraditional roles; in 1985, they appeared in 52% of the articles in nontraditional roles. Men made no such gains, although it must be remembered that men's roles have been much broader, so that there was less room for change. In 1885 and in 1985, they appeared in no nontraditional roles.

Language Choices. The New York Times remained until this year a stronghold against the use of "Ms." in naming women. It also generally avoided calling women by simple first and last names, without courtesy titles, although the Times style guide encourages the latter usage.[23] The 1985 Times sample showed little change in courtesy title use for women. Job-titles used to precede the name were rarely used for women in either sample. Use of last name alone or with first name increased by 18% in the 1985 sample. Use of first name alone for women decreased from

19% in 1885 to 2% in 1985.

Men continue to be recognized by economic role in 1985. Where women in 1985 showed only a 1% occurrence of job title coupled with last name, men were named by their job titles and last names 332 times, or 50% of the time in the 1985 sample. This is an increase of 36% from 1885. In addition, use of the less sexist first and last name or last name only dropped from 52% in 1885 to only 15% in 1985.

In terms of naming, gender differentiation along traditional sex roles for women has improved very little, while sex-role stereotyping of men has dramatically increased across the 100-year span of this study.

Signifiers for women and men in the samples were also placed in categories reflecting the traditional sex-role stereotypes of each sex. The categories were economic (traditionally male); familial roles, personality traits, and appearance (traditionally female); and other (word usages that did not fit traditional sex-role divisions). Women's appearance in economic roles has increased from 3 to 12% and familial role portrayal has dropped from 44 to 35%. Personality, appearance, and other signifier uses remained roughly the same. Men's economic roles again show a large increase, rising from 34% in 1885 to 62% in 1985. The "other," or non-sexist, category of signifiers dropped from 59% in 1885 to 30% in 1985 for men. Portrayal of men continues to ignore their existence in the family (2% in 1885, 1% in 1985) and to portray men as though they had no personality or appearance (less than 6% in these categories for either year). See Tables 5 through 8 for complete numeric results.

Factual, Inferential, Judgmental. Examination of the signifiers used for men and women shows some increase in the use of factual words, with a resultant decrease in inferential and judgmental words. For women, factual uses rose 10%, from 77% in 1885 to 87% in 1985; for men, factual uses rose 4%, from 87% in 1885 to 91% in 1985. This increase is not as great as one might expect; journalism history books emphasize the "yellow journalism" of the late 1800s, leading to an expectation of less factual and more judgmental and inferential references in the 1885 sample. However, only ten to fifteen percent of words used in the New York Times in 1885 were judgmental or inferential, and that remains the case. One possible explanation for journalism historians' perception of late 19th century journalism, here shown to be very factual, as sensational, comes from Hayakawa himself; he notes in his development of the factual, inferential, and judgmental categories that reporters may still select facts so as to serve their own biases.[24] Another explanation may be that some reportage continues to be sensational; it is difficult to tell which of the following phrases is from 1885 and which from 1985: "a blonde of the theatrical type," "a red-haired employee of a nude dancing club," "with a bland smile on her face" and "with her regal bearing, immaculate grooming,..." (The last three are from the 1985 sample.) Tables 5 through 8 summarize the factual, judgmental, and inferential references made in the samples.

Active/Passive Headlines. Results of the analysis of headlines were unanticipated. It was hypothesized that women would more often appear as acted upon, rather than acting. In 1885, 20% of women acted and 39% were acted upon; for 1985, those two categories for

women were nearly equal. It was also hypothesized that men would act more often. In fact, in 1885, women acted in 20% of the women's sample headlines, men in 14% of the men's. In 1985, women acted in 31% of the women's sample headlines and men acted in 39% of their headlines. However, 51% of the headlines of articles with a man as the protagonist showed that man being acted upon. This suggests that men are also seen as what Miller[25] would call "props" or "objects."

Headlines in 1885 frequently did not mention the sex of the protagonist of the article; 35% of the stories about women and 55% of those about men were headlined without mention of the protagonist's sex. For example, headlines read, "Capsized while fishing," "Teacher's attempt at suicide," "A veteran's ill luck," and "A romantic mendicant."

Headlines in 1985 stories about women misdirected attention from the main character; 20% of the women's headlines in that year were coded as "other," while only 4% of the men's headlines were "other."

DISCUSSION

Portrayal of women has become somewhat less sex-role identified in the New York Times in terms of the types of articles in which women appear, the roles they play in the articles, and, to a lesser extent, the language used to describe them. Naming of women remains gender-differentiated from naming of men by emphasis on familial roles. Also, although recent studies have shown that women comprise more than half of the professional workers in the United States, women's appearance in economic roles in the Times of 1985 was only

12% of the total, while women are placed in familial roles in 35% of the sample.

Men continue to receive prominence in the Times, although their lives are portrayed as working lives. Their participation in the family is ignored in news coverage. Even the names given them in the newspaper are likely to be job-related; half the time that men's names were given in the 1985 Times sample, they were prefaced with an economic role: "Commissioner Jones" or "attorney John Smith." Men also tend to serve as "props" in crime stories. They are on the receiving end of violence. In 51% of the 1985 headlines about men, they were the object of someone else's action.

Of the various methods of content analysis used here, the measures using individual words as the unit of analysis provided the greatest amount of detail (a somewhat obvious conclusion) and the strongest evidence of gender differentiation. Using the word as a unit of analysis is very time-consuming. However, the measure of "role portrayed" designed by Miller provides similar information with a much smaller expenditure of time and resources. Further studies using measures of prominence and space allotted should include a more comprehensive sample than was used here; information from these measures did not provide enough detail with this sample size to be used unaccompanied by other more comprehensive measures.

Finally, the results obtained here suggest that newspaper portrayal of women without sex-role stereotyping has improved over the 100-year span examined. However, women are not given equal space in the Times, nor is the proportion of their activities that take place in the working world accurately portrayed. Men, too, are shown

primarily in traditional gender roles in the Times of 1985. Perhaps because the previous decade did not bring a "men's liberation" movement, men have not been adequately considered in the changes made in gender-role differentiation. Particularly noteworthy is the increasing treatment of men as objects of another's action or victims of violence.

APPENDIX

GENERAL NEWS CATEGORIES

Adapted from Deutschmann, News-page Content of Twelve Metropolitan Dailies, by Stemple, 1985

1. Politics and Government Acts: This category was designed for stories primarily about the doings of government at the various levels from local to national. Political matters also are entered here. Subdivisions are politics, government acts, Communism in the U.S., and taxes.

2. War and Defense: This includes items dealing with war and rebellion, national defense, military use of missiles and space, ism. This includes both foreign and domestic

Foreign Relations: This includes both foreign and domestic items dealing with diplomacy and foreign relations. United Nations sessions and related activities normally fall into this category. Human rights issues are included here.

4. Economic Activity: This includes all nonfinancial page economic items. The subcategories are general economic activity, prices, money, labor and wages, and natural resources.

5. Agriculture: This includes all items about farming including farm prices and other matters pertaining to the economic aspects of agriculture.

6. Transportation and Travel: This includes all items about transportation and travel including the economic aspects.

7. Crime: This includes all crime stories with the exception of those falling into the next category, Public Moral Problems.

8. Public Moral Problems: The central theme of this category is human relations problems. The subcategories are public moral problems, alcohol, divorce, sex, civil court proceedings, drug abuse, and race relations.

9. Accidents and Disasters: Both man-made accidents (auto crashes) and natural disasters such as floods and earthquakes are included.

10. Science and Invention: This is a relatively narrow category involving science other than that that is defense-related or which is related to health and medicine. The subcategories are science, invention and research, nondefense space and nondefense nuclear science.

11. Public Health and Welfare: The central theme is welfare of people. Subcategories are public health and welfare solutions, health, public welfare, social and safety measures, welfare of children, marriage and marriage relations, and medicine.

12. Education, Religion, and Classic Arts: Includes also philathropy.

13. Popular Amusements: Includes entertainment and amusements, newspage sports, TV and radio, and press.

14. General Human Interest: Subcategories include general human interset, weather, obits, suicides, animals, cute children, and juvenile interest,

Gender Differentiation in the New York Times

Definitions of Role Categories

Politician/Public Official: *portrayed in an official capacity as the holder of any elective, appointive or salaried administrative position in federal, state or local government, or as a candidate for any such elective or appointive office.* (Includes salaried and unsalaried elective and appointive administrative positions; judges; all foreign political officials. Does not include superintendents of schools; police chiefs; salaried, non-administrative staff (= professional) or campaign staff (= professional or advocate); socializing or leisure activities.)

Professional: *portrayed in some professional or vocational role.* (Includes artists; military troops and officers; students engaged in academic activities; voluntary application of skills by which the person normally earns a living in a non-paying situation as a public service. Does not include public officials, sports figures or entertainers.)

Sports Figure: *portrayed in a professional or non-professional sports activity.* (Includes coaches; trainers; recreational sports. Does not include non-athletic activities by sports celebrities (i.e., socializing, advocacy); team owners or commissioners (= professional).)

Entertainer: *portrayed engaged in professional or non-professional entertainment.* (Includes directors; producers; recreational performances. Does not include non-entertainment activities by entertainment celebrities (i.e., socializing, advocacy); broadcast news persons (= professional).)

Socialite/Celebrity: *portrayed engaged in personal recreation, leisure, socializing.* (Includes beauty contestants and queens; celebrities not engaged in professional activities; attendance at fund-raising social events (charity balls, fashion shows, etc.). Does not include strictly non-recreational political campaign activities; behind-the-scenes charity work if the charity is clearly specified (= advocacy); leisure sports activities.)

Activist/Advocate: *portrayed as a spokesperson, representative or volunteer for some special interest cause, and/or as having deliberately thrust oneself into the public eye or sought publicity for oneself or a cause via a staged event, speech or other activity.* (Includes strikers; litigants; endorsements for products; proselytes. Does not include ordained ministers, priests or rabbis (= professional); "accidental" or human interest newsmakers "discovered" by the media; public service volunteers who apparently did not seek publicity; professionals who serve as spokespersons for their employer-clients (i.e., labor leaders, lawyers).)

Criminal: *portrayed as arrested for, charged with or convicted of breaking the law.* (Includes persons in custody; on trial. Does not include witnesses or persons not formally charged with a crime.)

Human Interest: *portrayed as falling into none of the above categories, and as having been discovered by the media without deliberate intention and as having become newsworthy for one's own activities.* (Includes accident victims; families of accident victims; witnesses; jurors. Does not include persons portrayed as having sought publicity for themselves or special interest causes; spouses of newsmakers; testimony regarding activities related to the person's professional role (= professional).)

Spouse: *portrayed as a newsmaker's spouse; or as making news by getting engaged, married or divorced.* (Includes brides; politicians' spouses; newsmakers or celebrities getting married or divorced. Does not include socialite/celebrity portrayals of politicians' spouses.)

Other: *portrayed in a role other than those described above.* (Includes other relatives of newsmakers (i.e., parents or children); persons portrayed as props for objects (i.e., fashion models, models holding new products or publicizing events).)

From Susan H. Miller, "Women's and Men's Roles in News Photos," Journalism Quarterly 52: 70-69,75 (1975).

TABLE 1. Prominence

	1985 women	1985 men
page 1	4	4
inside	30	39
business	-	-
lifestyle	-	1
entertainment	-	-
sports	1	1
no story in issue	9	-

TABLE 2. Topical Categorizations

	1885		1985	
	women	men	women	men
politics & govt.	-	-	3 (7%)	4 (9%)
war and defense	-	-	3 (7%)	7 (16%)
foreign relations	-	1 (2%)	4 (9%)	2 (4%)
economic activity	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	-	1 (2%)
agriculture	-	1 (2%)	-	-
transportation	-	1 (2%)	-	-
crime	4 (9%)	12 (29%)	7 (16%)	12 (27%)
public moral probs.	11 (24%)	8 (19%)	5 (11%)	3 (7%)
accidents	1 (2%)	6 (14%)	1 (2%)	-
science	-	-	1 (2%)	-
public health	16 (35%)	2 (5%)	3 (7%)	4 (9%)
education/religion	1 (2%)	-	3 (7%)	9 (20%)
popular amusements	1 (2%)	4 (10%)	5 (11%)	-
human interest	11 (24%)	4 (10%)	9 (20%)	3 (7%)
Total stories:	46	42	44	45

TABLE 3. Role Categorizations

	1885		1985	
	women	men	women	men
politician/ public official	-	-	9 (20%)	7 (16%)
professional	-	3 (7%)	7 (16%)	11 (24%)
sports figure	-	2 (5%)	3 (7%)	-
entertainer	1 (2%)	-	1 (2%)	-
socialite/ celebrity	1 (2%)	-	-	-
activist	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	3 (7%)	3 (7%)
criminal	6 (13%)	14 (33%)	4 (9%)	22 (49%)
human interest	16 (35%)	21 (49%)	10 (23%)	2 (4%)
spouse	17 (37%)	-	1 (2%)	-
other	4 (9%)	-	6 (14%)	-
Totals	46	43	44	45

TABLE 4. Proper Name Usage

	1885		1985	
	women	men	women	men
courtesy titles (Miss, Mrs., Mr.)	137 61%	84 22%	305 60%	227 34%
job title names (Lawyer Mary Jones)	0 -	94 24%	6 1%	332 50%
first+last name/last name (Mary Jones or Jones)	43 19%	202 52%	186 37%	100 15%
first name only (Mary)	42 19%	3 1%	12 2%	0 -
Totals	224	383	509	659

TABLE 5. Signifiers:
Sex-Role Categories/Factual, Inferential, Judgmental

Women 1885

	Factual	Inferential	Judgmental	Total
Familial Economic	8 signifiers Count: 10 Percent: 1	5 signifiers Count: 6 Percent: 1	2 signifiers Count: 3 Percent: 0	19 (3%)
	11 signifiers Count: 290 Percent: 43	4 signifiers Count: 5 Percent: 1	1 signifier Count: 1 Percent: 0	296 (44%)
Personality	2 signifiers Count: 3 Percent: 0	15 signifiers Count:16 Percent: 2	25 signifiers Count: 29 Percent: 4	48 (7%)
Appearance	5 signifiers Count: 6 Percent: 1	6 signifiers Count: 6 Percent: 1	9 signifiers Count: 15 Percent: 2	27 (4%)
Other	26 signifiers Count: 205 Percent: 31	18 signifiers Count: 47 Percent: 7	7 signifiers Count: 25 Percent: 4	277 (42%)
TOTALS	514 (77%)	80 (12%)	73 (11%)	667

TABLE 6. Signifiers:
Sex-Role Categories/Factual, Inferential, Judgmental

Women 1985

	Factual	Inferential	Judgmental	Total
Economic	55 signifiers Count: 114 Percent: 11	4 signifiers Count: 4 Percent: 0	2 signifiers Count: 2 Percent: 0	120 (12%)
Familial	10 signifiers Count: 339 Percent: 33	3 signifiers Count: 7 Percent: 1	3 signifiers Count: 9 Percent: 1	355 (35%)
Personality	9 signifiers Count: 10 Percent: 1	16 signifiers Count: 25 Percent: 2	18 signifiers Count: 23 Percent: 2	58 (6%)
Appearance	7 signifiers Count: 20 Percent: 2	10 signifiers Count: 10 Percent: 1	1 signifier Count: 1 Percent: 0	31 (3%)
Other	61 signifiers Count: 406 Percent: 40	12 signifiers Count: 12 Percent: 1	13 signifiers Count: 36 Percent: 4	454 (45%)
TOTALS	889 (87%)	58 (6%)	71 (7%)	1018

TABLE 7. Signifiers:
Sex-Role Categories/Factual, Inferential, Judgmental

Men 1885

	Factual	Inferential	Judgmental	Total
Familial Economic	70 signifiers Count: 276 Percent: 33	5 signifiers Count: 5 Percent: 1	4 signifiers Count: 5 Percent: 1	286 (34%)
	5 signifiers Count: 15 Percent: 2	0 signifiers Count: 0 Percent: 0	0 signifiers Count: 0 Percent: 0	15 (2%)
Personality	1 signifier Count: 1 Percent: 0	10 signifiers Count: 12 Percent: 1	20 signifiers Count: 20 Percent: 2	33 (4%)
Appearance	8 signifiers Count: 8 Percent: 1	6 signifiers Count: 6 Percent: 1	2 signifiers Count: 2 Percent: 0	16 (2%)
Other	38 signifiers Count: 421 Percent: 51	22 signifiers Count: 43 Percent: 5	11 signifiers Count: 20 Percent: 2	484 (59%)
TOTALS	721 (87%)	66 (8%)	47 (6%)	834

TABLE 8. Signifiers:
Sex-Role Categories/Factual, Inferential, Judgmental

Men 1985

Factual	Inferential	Judgmental	Total
98 signifiers Count: 592 Percent: 60	8 signifiers Count: 11 Percent: 1	9 signifiers Count: 12 Percent: 1	615 (62%)
3 signifiers Count: 10 Percent: 1	0 signifiers Count: 0 Percent: 0	0 signifiers Count: 0 Percent: 0	10 (1%)
14 signifiers Count: 18 Percent: 2	14 signifiers Count: 16 Percent: 2	20 signifiers Count: 22 Percent: 2	56 (6%)
2 signifiers Count: 3 Percent: 0	4 signifiers Count: 4 Percent: 0	0 signifiers Count: 0 Percent: 0	7 (1%)
60 signifiers Count: 274 Percent: 28	7 signifiers Count: 14 Percent: 1	7 signifiers Count: 9 Percent: 1	297 (30%)
TOTALS 897 (91%)	45 (5%)	43 (4%)	985

TABLE 9. Placement in Active/Passive Headlines

	1885		1985	
	women	men	women	men
woman acts	10	0	16	0
woman is acted upon	20	0	15	0
woman is	0	0	4	0
man acts	0	7	0	20
man is acted upon	3	8	0	26
man is	0	0	0	1
other	18	28	10	2
summary:				
character acts	10 (20%)	7 (14%)	16 (31%)	20 (39%)
character is acted upon	20 (39%)	8 (16%)	15 (29%)	26 (51%)
character is	0	0	4 (8%)	1 (2%)
other	18/ (35%/ +3 +6%)	28 (55%)	10 (20%)	2 (4%)

REFERENCES

1. Junetta Davis, "Sexist Bias in Eight Newspapers," Journalism Quarterly, 59:456-460 (1982).

2. Susan H. Miller, "The Content of News Photos: Women's and Men's Roles," Journalism Quarterly, 52:70-75 (1975).

3. Zena Beth Guenin, "Women's Pages in American Newspapers: Missing Out on Contemporary Content," Journalism Quarterly, 52:66-69,75 (1975).

4. Roy E. Blackwood, "The Content of News Photos: Roles Portrayed by Men and Women," Journalism Quarterly, 60:710-714 (1983).

5. Lee Jolliffe and Turner Bond, "Sex-Role Stereotyping in Two Newspapers of 1885: The Influence of the Pioneer Effort," AEJMC annual convention, Memphis, Tenn., August 1985.

6. F. Earle Barcus, Images of Life on Children's Television: Sex Roles, Minorities, and Families (New York: Praeger Press, 1983), pp. 3-65.

7. Guido H. Stempel, III, Conversation with the author (1985).

8. The number 45 was not arbitrarily selected; in a previous study, the 1885 New York Times samples were compared with a sample of 45 available stories from another newspaper. This sample was made available for the current study.

9. Miller, op. cit., p. 72.

10. Guenin, op. cit., p. 67.

11. Davis, op. cit., p. 457.

12. Michael Ryan and Dorothea Owen, "A Content Analysis of Metropolitan Newspaper Coverage of Social Issues," Journalism Quarterly, 54:634-40, 671 (1976).

13. Barcus, op. cit., p. 14.

14. Guido H. Stempel, III., "General News Categories Adapted from Deutschmann," Ohio University, 1984; from Paul J. Deutschmann, News-page Content of Twelve Metropolitan Dailies (Cincinnati: Scripps Howard Research, 1959), pp. 58-62.

15. Miller, op. cit., p. 71.

16. Among them: Sydney Head, "Content Analysis of Television Drama Programs," Quarterly of Film, Radio and Television 9 (1954); Melvin DeFluer, "Occupational Roles as Portrayed on Televison," Public Opinion Quarterly 28 (Spring 1964); Judith Bardwick and Suzanne Schumann, "Portrait of American Men and Women in TV Commercials," Psychology, 4:4 (1967); Gaye Tuchman, Arlene Kaplan Daniels, and Stephen Benet, eds., Hearth and Home: Images of Women in the Mass Media. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978); and UNESCO, Mass Media: The Image, Role, and Social Conditions of Women. (Paris: Reports and Papers on Mass Communication, 1979).

17. Jean Faust, "Words That Oppress," Women Speaking (April 1970); Nancy Barron, "Sex-Typed Language: the Product of Grammatical Causes," Acta Sociologica 14:24-72 (1971); Varda One, "Manglish," Everywoman (Venice, California, 1971); Elizabeth Burr, Susan Dunn, and Norma Farquhar, "Women and the Language of Inequality," Social Ed., 36:841-45 (1972); Robin Lakoff, Language and Woman's Place. (New York: Harper Colophon, 1975); Alleen Pace Nilsen, Haig Bosmajian, H. Lee Gershuny, and Julia P. Stanley, Sexism and Language. (National Council of Teachers of English: Urbana, Ill., 1977).

18. Jolliffe and Bond, op. cit.

19. Michael Ryan, "Reports, Inferences and Judgments in News Coverage of Social Issues," Journalism Quarterly, 56:497-503 (1979); Jolliffe and Bond, op. cit.; S. I. Hayakawa, Language in Thought and Action, 4th ed. (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978), pp.32-44.

20. Ole R. Holsti, Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969).

21. Junetta Davis, op. cit., p. 457.

22. John W. Windhauser and Guido H. Stempel, III, op. cit., p. 149.

23. Lewis Jordan, ed., The New York Times Manual of Style and Usage. (New York: Quadrangle/The New York Times Book Co., 1976).

24. S.I. Hayakawa, op. cit., pp. 41-44.

25. Miller, op. cit., p. 71.